

Inverse Seesaw Neutrino Mass from Lepton Triplets in the $U(1)_\Sigma$ Model

Ernest Ma

*Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of California,
Riverside, California 92521, USA*

Abstract

The inverse seesaw mechanism of neutrino mass, i.e. $m_\nu \simeq (m_D^2/m_N^2)\epsilon_L$ where ϵ_L is small, is discussed in the context of the $U(1)_\Sigma$ model. This is a gauge extension of the Standard Model of particle interactions with lepton triplets $(\Sigma^+, \Sigma^0, \Sigma^-)$ as (Type III) seesaw anchors for obtaining small Majorana neutrino masses.

Introduction : If the $SU(3)_C \times SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y$ Standard Model (SM) of particle interactions is extended [1, 2] to include a lepton triplet $(\Sigma^+, \Sigma^0, \Sigma^-)$ per family, then the heavy Majorana mass of Σ^0 acts as a seesaw anchor for the neutrino to acquire a small mass, just as in the case of using a singlet N . This is often referred to as Type III seesaw [3]. It has also been shown [4, 5, 6, 7] that this addition admits a new $U(1)_\Sigma$ gauge symmetry, with the following charges:

$$(u, d)_L \sim (3, 2, \frac{1}{6}) \quad : \quad n_1, \quad (1)$$

$$u_R \sim (3, 1, \frac{2}{3}) \quad : \quad n_2 = \frac{1}{4}(7n_1 - 3n_4), \quad (2)$$

$$d_R \sim (3, 1, -\frac{1}{3}) \quad : \quad n_3 = \frac{1}{4}(n_1 + 3n_4), \quad (3)$$

$$(\nu, e)_L \sim (1, 2, -\frac{1}{2}) \quad : \quad n_4, \quad (4)$$

$$e_R \sim (1, 1, -1) \quad : \quad n_5 = \frac{1}{4}(-9n_1 + 5n_4), \quad (5)$$

$$(\Sigma^+, \Sigma^0, \Sigma^-)_R \sim (1, 3, 0) \quad : \quad n_6 = \frac{1}{4}(3n_1 + n_4). \quad (6)$$

Consider now the *inverse* seesaw mechanism: a situation is established where $m_\nu = 0$ because of a symmetry, which is then broken by a *small* mass parameter [8, 9, 10, 11, 12]. As a result, m_ν is proportional to this symmetry-breaking parameter (and not inversely proportional to m_N as in the usual seesaw). The prototype model is to add a singlet Dirac fermion N , i.e. both N_R and N_L , with lepton number $L = 1$ per family to the SM. The 3×3 mass matrix spanning $(\bar{\nu}_L, N_R, \bar{N}_L)$ is then given by

$$\mathcal{M}_{\nu, N} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & m_D & 0 \\ m_D & \epsilon_R & m_N \\ 0 & m_N & \epsilon_L \end{pmatrix}, \quad (7)$$

where $\epsilon_{L,R}$ are lepton-number violating Majorana mass terms. This is a natural extension of the famous 2×2 seesaw mass matrix, but it also has a clear symmetry interpretation, i.e. $\epsilon_{L,R}$ may be naturally small because their absence would correspond to the exact conservation of lepton number. [A linear combination of ν_L and N_L would combine with N_R to form a

Dirac fermion, whereas its orthogonal combination would remain massless.] Using $\epsilon_{L,R} \ll m_D, m_N$, the smallest mass eigenvalue of Eq. (7) is then $(m_D^2/m_N^2)\epsilon_L$ which can be small because ϵ_L is small even if m_N is only 1 TeV.

Inverse seesaw using $U(1)_\Sigma$: To implement the inverse seesaw in the $U(1)_\Sigma$ model, the lepton triplet

$$(\Sigma^+, \Sigma^0, \Sigma^-)_L \sim (1, 3, 0) : n_7 \quad (8)$$

is added. This will not change $n_{1,2,3,4,5}$, but now

$$n_6 - n_7 = \frac{1}{4}(3n_1 + n_4) \equiv n_0 \quad (9)$$

is required to cancel the $[SU(2)]^2 U(1)_\Sigma$ triangle anomaly. Using this, the mixed gravitational-gauge anomaly of $U(1)_\Sigma$ is also zero. However, the $[U(1)_\Sigma]^3$ triangle anomaly is no longer zero, unless either $n_7 = 0$ or $n_6 = 0$. Extra singlets are needed to cancel this anomaly without affecting the others. Details will be presented in a later section.

To be specific, consider the case $n_1 = n_4 = 1$, and $n_6 = -1$, then $n_0 = n_2 = n_3 = 1$, $n_5 = -1$, and $n_7 = -2$. Three Higgs doublets are needed:

$$(\phi^+, \phi^0)_1 : n_1 - n_3 = n_2 - n_1 = \frac{3}{4}(n_1 - n_4) = 0, \quad (10)$$

$$(\phi^+, \phi^0)_2 : n_4 - n_5 = \frac{1}{4}(9n_1 - n_4) = 2, \quad (11)$$

$$(\phi^+, \phi^0)_3 : n_6 - n_4 = -\frac{1}{4}(3n_1 + 5n_4) = -2, \quad (12)$$

coupling to quarks, charged leptons, and neutrinos respectively. Note that $(\Sigma^+, \Sigma^0, \Sigma^-)_L$ does not couple to $(\nu, e)_L$ because $-n_7 - n_4 = 2n_0 - n_4 = 1$ and there is no Higgs doublet with that charge. Add scalar singlets with $U(1)_\Sigma$ charges as follows:

$$\chi_1 \sim -1, \quad \chi_2 \sim 2, \quad \chi_4 \sim -4, \quad (13)$$

then the term $\bar{\Sigma}_L \Sigma_R \chi_1$ provides a Dirac mass m_Σ linking Σ_L with Σ_R and the analog of

Eq. (7) is

$$\mathcal{M}_{\nu,\Sigma} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & m_D & 0 \\ m_D & m_2 & m_\Sigma \\ 0 & m_\Sigma & m_4 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (14)$$

where m_D comes from $\langle \phi_3^0 \rangle$, m_Σ from $\langle \chi_1 \rangle$, m_2 from $\langle \chi_2 \rangle$, and m_4 from $\langle \chi_4 \rangle$.

Higgs structure of $U(1)_\Sigma$: To understand why m_4 can be very small in Eq. (14), consider the Higgs potential involving $\chi_{1,2,4}$:

$$V_\chi = \sum_i \mu_i^2 \chi_i^\dagger \chi_i + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j} \lambda_{ij} (\chi_i^\dagger \chi_i) (\chi_j^\dagger \chi_j) + [\mu_{21} \chi_2 \chi_1^2 + \mu_{42} \chi_4 \chi_2^2 + \lambda_{124} \chi_1^2 \chi_2^\dagger \chi_4^\dagger + H.c.], \quad (15)$$

where $\lambda_{ij} = \lambda_{ji}$. Let $\langle \chi_i \rangle = u_i$, then the conditions for V_χ to be at its minimum are

$$u_1 [\mu_1^2 + \lambda_{11} u_1^2 + \lambda_{12} u_2^2 + \lambda_{14} u_4^2 + 2\mu_{21} u_2 + 2\lambda_{124} u_2 u_4] = 0, \quad (16)$$

$$u_2 [\mu_2^2 + \lambda_{12} u_1^2 + \lambda_{22} u_2^2 + \lambda_{24} u_4^2 + 2\mu_{42} u_4] + \mu_{21} u_1^2 + \lambda_{124} u_1^2 u_4 = 0, \quad (17)$$

$$u_4 [\mu_4^2 + \lambda_{14} u_1^2 + \lambda_{24} u_2^2 + \lambda_{44} u_4^2] + \mu_{42} u_2^2 + \lambda_{124} u_1^2 u_2 = 0. \quad (18)$$

A natural solution exists [13, 14, 15], such that $u_4 \ll u_2 \ll u_1$, i.e.

$$u_1^2 \simeq \frac{-\mu_1^2}{\lambda_{11}}, \quad u_2 \simeq \frac{-\mu_{21} u_1^2}{\mu_2^2 + \lambda_{12} u_1^2}, \quad u_4 \simeq \frac{-u_2 (\mu_{42} u_2 + \lambda_{124} u_1^2)}{\mu_4^2 + \lambda_{14} u_1^2}. \quad (19)$$

If $\mu_{21} = 0$ and $\lambda_{124} = 0$, then an extra global $U(1)$ symmetry exists for χ_1 in Eq. (15). If $\mu_{42} = 0$ and $\lambda_{124} = 0$, then the same holds for χ_4 . Hence it may be argued that μ_{21} , μ_{42} , and λ_{124} are naturally small. For example, let $u_1 \sim \mu_2 \sim \mu_4 \sim m_\Sigma \sim 1$ TeV, $\mu_{21} \sim \mu_{42} \sim 1$ GeV, and $\lambda_{124} \sim 10^{-6}$, then $u_2 \sim 1$ GeV, $u_4 \sim 1$ keV, and $m_\nu \simeq (m_D^2/m_\Sigma^2)m_4 \sim 0.1$ eV for $m_4 \sim u_4 \sim 1$ keV and $m_D \sim 10$ GeV. The mixing between ν_L and Σ_L^0 is given by $m_D/m_\Sigma \sim 10^{-2}$ (and that between e_L^- and Σ_L^- by $\sqrt{2}m_D/m_\Sigma$) which is not constrained directly by the neutrino mass and may well be observable.

With the addition of $\Phi_{1,2,3}$, there are the following allowed terms:

$$\Phi_1^\dagger \Phi_2 \Phi_1^\dagger \Phi_3, \quad \Phi_1^\dagger \Phi_2 \chi_2^\dagger, \quad \Phi_1^\dagger \Phi_2 \chi_1^2, \quad \Phi_1^\dagger \Phi_3 \chi_2, \quad \Phi_1^\dagger \Phi_3 (\chi_1^\dagger)^2, \quad \Phi_2^\dagger \Phi_3 \chi_4^\dagger, \quad \Phi_2^\dagger \Phi_3 \chi_2^2. \quad (20)$$

This shows that there is no extra unwanted $U(1)$ global symmetry. Since Φ_2 and Φ_3 have opposite charges under $U(1)_\Sigma$, $Z - Z'_\Sigma$ mixing is zero if $v_2 = v_3$ is imposed.

Additional fermion singlets and dark matter: The $[U(1)_\Sigma]^3$ triangle anomaly per family is given by

$$3n_0^3 - 3n_6^3 + 3n_7^3 = -9n_0n_6n_7 = -18, \quad (21)$$

where Eq. (9) has been used. To cancel it, add $(2, 4, 2)$ copies of left-handed fermion singlets (S_1, S_3, S_5) of charges $(1/2, -3/2, 5/2)$ respectively. Then $2(1/2)^3 + 4(-3/2)^3 + 2(5/2)^3 = 18$ and $2(1/2) + 4(-3/2) + 2(5/2) = 0$, as desired. The S_i fermions do not couple to $(\nu, e)_L$ through any of the three Higgs doublets because of their $U(1)_\Sigma$ charges. This is important, otherwise m_ν will have contributions from them as well. They do couple among themselves through χ_1 , i.e. $S_1S_1\chi_1$, $S_1S_3\chi_1^\dagger$, and $S_3S_5\chi_1$. This means that all S_i fermions are heavy at the $U(1)_\Sigma$ breaking scale. The lightest among them is then a possible dark-matter candidate, having a conserved residual parity [16, 17, 18, 19] from $U(1)_\Sigma$ breaking.

$U(1)_\Sigma$ phenomenology: There are two salient features of the proposed $U(1)_\Sigma$ model. One is the new Z'_Σ boson, which is observable at the Large Hadron Collider (LHC) if kinematically allowed [5, 7]. The other is the Dirac lepton triplet $(\Sigma^+, \Sigma^0, \Sigma^-)$, as opposed to the usual Majorana triplet of the Type III seesaw [3]. Instead of just one kind of heavy charged lepton $\Sigma^\pm$ with mass m_Σ [20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34], there are two kinds [35, 36] in this model with (essentially) the same mass. Let $\Sigma_{L,R}^+$ be called Σ_1^+ and $\Sigma_{L,R}^-$ be called Σ_2^- , then $\Sigma_1^\pm$ has $L = \pm 1$, whereas $\Sigma_2^\pm$ has $L = \mp 1$. Hence only Σ_2^- mixes significantly with the usual charged lepton e^- and Σ^0 with ν . Consequently, Σ_2^- will decay into both e^-Z and νW^- , but Σ_1^+ only into νW^+ . Unfortunately, since they have the same mass, they are not distinguishable at the LHC or a linear e^+e^- collider. On the other hand, in an e^-p collider, only Σ_2^- and Σ_1^+ are produced. They may thus be distinguished by their decay modes.

Conclusion : The inverse seesaw mechanism of neutrino mass is very much suited for measurable effects at the TeV scale, through the mixing of new heavy fermions with the known leptons. In the usual seesaw, this mixing is constrained by the smallness of the neutrino mass and may well be too negligible for it to be observed. In the proposed $U(1)_\Sigma$ model, with a new Z'_Σ boson as well as three Dirac lepton triplets ($\Sigma^+, \Sigma^0, \Sigma^-$), a rich phenomenology is expected at the LHC and beyond.

Acknowledgement : This work was supported in part by the U. S. Department of Energy under Grant No. DE-FG03-94ER40837.

References

- [1] R. Foot, H. Lew, X.-G. He, and G. C. Joshi, Z. Phys. **C44**, 441 (1989).
- [2] E. Ma, Phys. Rev. Lett. **81**, 1171 (1998).
- [3] For a recent review, see for example E. Ma, arXiv:0810.5574 [hep-ph].
- [4] E. Ma, Mod. Phys. Lett. **A17**, 535 (2002).
- [5] E. Ma and D. P. Roy, Nucl. Phys. **B644**, 290 (2002).
- [6] S. M. Barr and I. Dorsner, Phys. Rev. **D72**, 015011 (2005); see also S. M. Barr, B. Bednarz, and C. Benesh, Phys. Rev. **D34**, 235 (1986).
- [7] R. Adhikari, J. Erler, and E. Ma, Phys. Lett. **B672**, 136 (2009).
- [8] D. Wyler and L. Wolfenstein, Nucl. Phys. **B218**, 205 (1983).
- [9] R. N. Mohapatra and J. W. F. Valle, Phys. Rev. **D34**, 1642 (1986).
- [10] E. Ma, Phys. Lett. **B191**, 287 (1987).
- [11] E. Ma, arXiv:0904.1580 [hep-ph].
- [12] E. Ma, arXiv:0904.4450 [hep-ph].
- [13] E. Ma and U. Sarkar, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80**, 5716 (1998).
- [14] E. Ma, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 2502 (2001).

- [15] W. Grimus, L. Lavoura, and B. Radovic, Phys. Lett. **B674**, 117 (2009).
- [16] T. Hur, H.-S. Lee, and S. Nasri, Phys. Rev. **D77**, 015008 (2008).
- [17] H.-S. Lee, Phys. Lett. **B663**, 255 (2008).
- [18] E. Ma, Mod. Phys. Lett. **23**, 721 (2008).
- [19] E. Ma, Phys. Rev. **D78**, 017701 (2008).
- [20] E. Ma, Phys. Lett. **B625**, 76 (2005).
- [21] B. Bajc and G. Senjanovic, JHEP **0708**, 014 (2007).
- [22] I. Dorsner and P. Fileviez Perez, JHEP **0706**, 029 (2007).
- [23] B. Bajc, M. Nemevsek, and G. Senjanovic, Phys. Rev. **D76**, 055011 (2007).
- [24] P. Fileviez Perez, Phys. Rev. **D76**, 071701 (2007).
- [25] R. Franceschini, T. Hambye, and A. Strumia, Phys. Rev. **D78**, 033002 (2008).
- [26] A. Abada, C. Biggio, F. Bonnet, M. B. Gavela, and T. Hambye, Phys. Rev. **D78**, 033007 (2008).
- [27] W. Fischler and R. Flauger, JHEP **0809**, 020 (2008).
- [28] R. N. Mohapatra, N. Okada, and H.-B. Yu, Phys. Rev. **D78**, 075011 (2008).
- [29] E. Ma and D. Suematsu, Mod. Phys. Lett. **A24**, 583 (2009).
- [30] F. del Aguila and J. A. Aguilar-Saavedra, Nucl. Phys. **B813**, 22 (2009).
- [31] E. Ma, arXiv:0806.4386 [hep-ph].
- [32] X.-G. He and S. Oh, arXiv:0902.4082 [hep-ph].
- [33] A. Arhrib, R. Benbrik, C.-H. Chen, arXiv:0903.1553 [hep-ph].
- [34] A. Arhrib, B. Bajc, D. K. Ghosh, T. Han, G.-Y. Huang, I. Puljak, and G. Senjanovic, arXiv:0904.2390 [hep-ph].
- [35] F. del Aguila and J. A. Aguilar-Saavedra, Phys. Lett. **B672**, 158 (2009).
- [36] J. A. Aguilar-Saavedra, arXiv:0905.2221 [hep-ph].